THE PLAYS
OF
PHILIP MASSINGER
STAGE HISTORY AND ADAPTATIONS, 1660-1722

A Portion of
A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS
UNIVERSITY IN CONFORMITY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
1931

BY
JAMES G. McMANAWAY

BALTIMORE
1934

THE PLAYS
OF
PHILIP MASSINGER

STAGE HISTORY AND ADAPTATIONS, 1660-1722

A Portion of

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY IN CONFORMITY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

1931

BY

JAMES G. McMANAWAY

BALTIMORE

1934

R. UNIV.
BIBLIOTHEEK
LEIDEN

THE PLAYS OF PHILIP MASSINGER

Stage History and Adaptations, 1660-1722

SUMMARY

Part I. Stage History and Influence

Chapter 1. From the Reopening of the Theaters to the Union of the Companies in 1682.

A record of the revivals of Massinger's plays by Restoration actors: *The Bondman, The Virgin Martyr, The Renegado, A New Way to Pay Old Debts.* Alterations and adaptations: Thompson's *Life of Mother Shipton,* the anonymous *Love Lost in the Dark,* Mrs. Behn's *City Heiress.* Plays that may be indebted to Massinger's: Dryden's *Wild Gallant,* Shadwell's *True Widow,* Lee's *Theodosius.*

Chapter 2. From the Union of the Companies in 1682 until 1722.

Alterations and adaptations: Rowe's *Fair Penitent,* Griffin's *Injured Virtue,* Betterton's (?) *Bondman,* anonymous *Roman Actor.* Borrowings by Lacy in *Sir Hercules Buffoon*; by Ravenscroft in *The Canterbury Guests.*

Part II. Alterations and Adaptations

Chapter 3. Alterations and Adaptations from 1660 to 1700.

A detailed examination of the MS version of *The Renegado*; of the adaptation, *Love Lost in the Dark*; and of changes made in material incorporated in *The Life of Mother Shipton, The City Heiress,* and *The Canterbury Guests.*

Chapter 4. Alterations and Adaptations from 1700 to 1722.

A similar analysis of changes made by Rowe in writing *The Fair Penitent,* by Griffin in *Injured Virtue,* by Betterton (?) in *The Bondman,* and by the anonymous adapter of *The Roman Actor.* The suggestion is made that Thomas Walker, the actor, may have prepared the acting versions of *The Bondman* and *The Roman Actor.*

Appendix I.

A comparison of readings in the four quartos of *The Virgin Martyr* to show that that of 1661 was printed from the quarto of 1651.

Appendix II.

Misplaced Speech Tags in *The Canterbury Guests.*

General Bibliography

Bibliography of Editions of Massinger's Plays

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/IA41547018_0035

[Reprinted from *ELH, A Journal of English Literary History*, Vol. I, No. 3, December, 1934.]

PHILIP MASSINGER AND THE RESTORATION DRAMA

By James G. McManaway

The continuity of English drama in the seventeenth century, formerly a disputed point, is no longer seriously questioned. Opinion still differs, however, about the relative importance of English tradition and of French and Spanish romance and drama in the development of such *genres* as the comedy of manners and heroic tragedy. One approach to the problem is by way of studies of individual Caroline dramatists and their contribution to dramatic tradition. Shakespeare and Beaumont and Fletcher have thus been studied.[1] I propose to examine briefly some of the plays of Philip Massinger in an attempt to discover his treatment of certain situations and characters familiar in Restoration drama and then to estimate his influence by tracing the stage history of his plays and their adaptations from 1660 to 1700.

First let us mention some of the qualities of Massinger's plays. Every commentator has agreed that Massinger possessed marked ability in the construction of plots. His closely knit plots, in which catastrophe usually grows out of character, are in marked contrast to the episodic plays of Fletcher. To him was given by his collaborators the task of writing the opening, expository scenes, and many of the closing scenes, in which the various actions are brought to an end. In characterization Massinger was less successful; most of his characters are types, and many of them become merely the mouthpieces of the author in his social criticism. But they vary in their natures less wildly with the exigencies of the plot than do the characters in the plays of Massinger's contemporaries. Massinger was influenced by both Shakespeare and Jonson in his handling of characters. He never quite succeeded, like Shakespeare, in depicting the growth or decay of a complex character

[1] G. C. D. Odell, *Shakespeare from Betterton to Irving*, New York, 1920; Montague Summers, *Shakespeare Adaptations*, London, 1922; Hazelton Spencer, *Shakespeare Improved*, Cambridge, Mass., 1927; A. C. Sprague, *Beaumont and Fletcher on the Restoration Stage*, Cambridge, Mass., 1926; J. H. Wilson, *The Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Restoration Drama*, Columbus, Ohio, 1928.

buffeted by fate,[2] but the attempt gave warmth and humanity to more than one play. None of his characters are quite like those in Jonson's comedies of humours, but such names as Signior Sylli, Stargaze, and Adorio, and even such dominating personalities as Sir Giles Overreach and Luke Frugal owe much to Jonsonian influence.

All of Massinger's critics have recognized the seriousness of his moral purpose and his insistence upon the didactic functions of the stage.[3] It is not surprising, then, to find that his plays contain fewer episodic situations involving questionable morality than those of Beaumont and Fletcher, fewer licentious characters, less of "that witty obscenity . . . which like poison infused in pleasant liquor is alwayes the more dangerous the more delightful."[4] Massinger's first impulse was to instruct the individual and criticize society by the dramatic opposition of virtuous and vicious characters. But like many another moralist, he found his means defeating his ends. It is a fact that virtuous characters on the stage tend to become self-conscious and priggish and their conduct dull and stodgy, whereas their opposites often speak and act gaily and appear to live glamorously. Witty inconstants, gay deceivers, scenes of purple passion are more apt to linger in the memory than sober characters or temporate lives.

Another danger beset Massinger. No reader of his plays can believe for an instant that he could feel at home in an a-moral society. Human conduct was something about which he was deadly serious. He was at his best when ridiculing folly or castigating vice. But social criticism was not relished by the court and theater-goers in the time of James I and Charles I. They wanted sprightly amusement. So in spite of himself Massinger had frequently to write in Fletcherian vein. The language of passion and obscenity, however unnatural to him, was not unknown, but it did not come trippingly from the tongue. Often the results are less witty than disgusting. Situa-

[2] R. S. Telfer, ed., *Unnatural Combat*, Princeton, 1932, pp. 47 ff., thinks Malefort an illustration of Shakespeare's influence.

[3] See, for instance, "Philip Massinger" by B. T. Spencer in *Seventeenth Century Studies*, ed. Robert Shafer, Princeton, 1933, pp. 3-119.

[4] Richard Flecknoe says that Fletcher's plays first had this quality. See his *Short Discourse on the English Stage* (1664), reprinted in *Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century*, 2. 91-6, ed. J. E. Spingarn, Oxford, 1908.

tions that Fletcher would handle deftly by insinuation are stated by Massinger with an explicitness that is positively erotic.

Licentiousness seems really to have had a fascination for him. Though he punishes Corisca (*Bondman*) and Iolante (*Guardian*) for their sins, nothing could be much more stimulating than the scenes (*Bondman* 2.2; *Guardian* 2.2; 3.4) in which their vices are displayed. In the same way the voluptuousness of Donusa (*Renegado*) is depicted *con amore*; pure love does not win her to repentance until passion has held full sway. For a somewhat different, but still heavy-handed effect, read the "stallion" scenes in *The Custom of the Country*, which are generally attributed to Massinger.

Despite the presence of occasional scenes and characters of this sort, Massinger's plays declined in popularity as Shirley's and Brome's won public favor. The reason, I think, was what I have indicated: Massinger was too much the moralist; he was not naturally, or wittily, salacious.

The play in which Massinger comes nearest to urbanity and suavity is *The Guardian*, licensed October 31, 1633. Its most entertaining features—in the Restoration sense—are Adorio, "a young libertine"; Durazzo, the Guardian, with "the colt's tooth still in [his] mouth"; and Mirtilla, a pert maid. Adorio's philosophy of life is familiar to readers of Fletcher's *Wild Goose Chase* and of the Restoration comedies of manners. To Calista, who pursues him almost as shamelessly as Oriana does Mirabel, the Wild Goose, he says (1.1):

> You are a virgin . . .
> A noble virgin, for whose grace and favours
> The Italian princes might contend as rivals;
> Yet unto me, a thing far, far beneath you,
> (A noted libertine I profess myself,)
> In your mind there does appear one fault so gross,
> Nay, I might say unpardonable at your years,
> If justly you consider it, that I cannot
> As you desire, affect you. . . .
> You are too honest,
> And, like your mother, too strict and religious,
> And talk too soon of marriage; I shall break,
> If at that rate I purchase you. Can I part with
> My uncurb'd liberty, and on my neck

Wear such a heavy yoke? hazard my fortunes,
With all the expected joys my life can yield me,
For one commodity, before I prove it?
Venus forbid on both sides! . . .
If you love me
In the way young people should, I'll fly to meet it,
And we'll meet merrily. . . .
Think on't, a close friend,
Or private mistress, is court rhetoric;
A wife, mere rustic solecism.

Durazzo, who overhears this speech, so much approves the sentiments that he exclaims:

A well-bred gentleman!
I am thinking now if ever in the dark,
Or drunk, I met his mother: he must have
Some drops of my blood in him, for at his years
I was much of his religion.

Durazzo has a positive theory of education. In answer to the reproaches of his friends, he tells them that his nephew and ward, Caldoro, is not being reared extravagantly.

They [the critics] would have me
Train up my ward a hopeful youth, to keep
A merchant's book; or at the plough, and clothe him
In canvas or coarse cotton; while I fell
His woods, grant leases, which he must make good
When he comes to age, or be compelled to marry
With a cast whore and three bastards; let him know
No more than how to cipher well, or do
His tricks by the square root; grant him no pleasure
But quoits and nine-pins. . . .
He wears rich clothes, I do so; keeps horses, games,
and wenches;
'Tis not amiss, so it be done with decorum:
In an heir 'tis ten times more excusable
Than to be over-thrifty.

This sounds much like the opinion of Sir Edward Belfond in Shadwell's *Squire of Alsatia* (Drury Lane, May, 1688). Both dramatists may have had in mind the *Adelphi* of Terence.

As for the pert maid, Mirtilla, let the following conversation with her mistress, Calista introduce her. Calista, who has just been reprimanded by her mother, is not unlike her Restoration nieces.

Calis. Not stir abroad!
The use and pleasure of our eyes denied us!
Mirt. Insufferable.
Calis. Nor write, nor yet receive
An amorous letter!
Mirt. Not to be endured.
Calis. Nor look upon a man out of a window!
Mirt. Flat tyranny, insupportable tyranny,
To a lady of your blood. . . .
Run away from't;
Take any course.
Calis. But without means, Mirtilla,
How shall we live?
Mirt. What a question's that! as if
A buxom lady could want maintenance
In any place in the world, where there are men,
Wine, meat, or money stirring. . . .
I grant your honour is a specious dressing,
But without conversation of men,
A kind of nothing. . . .
If she would allow you
A dancer in the morning to well breathe you,
A songster in the afternoon, a servant
To air you in the evening; give you leave
To see the theatre twice a week, to mark
How the old actors decay, the young sprout up,
(A fitting observation,) you might bear it;
But not to see, or talk, or touch a man,
Abominable!
Calis. Do not my blushes speak
How willingly I would assent?
Mirt. Sweet lady,
Do something to deserve them, and blush after.

The rôles of Paris in *The Roman Actor* (licensed October 11, 1626) and Pisander in *The Bondman* (licensed December 3, 1623) afford excellent opportunities to a good actor. Of the two characters, Pisander has more of the qualities of the lover of heroic drama. His love for Cleora is as extravagant and his submission to her will as complete as in the later plays. The fate of the city-state hangs in the balances as Pisander's fortunes vary. Finally he wins Cleora, but not by virtue of his own exertions; she has to take matters into her own hands.

It is safe, I think, to say that Massinger is the best link between the early drama and the later. His career as a play-

wright began, probably, before the death of Shakespeare and possibly before his retirement; it ended with his death, in March, 1639, just three years before the closing of the theatres. At times he attains to something almost Shakespearian in characterization and Jonsonian in seriousness; at other times he indulges in romance, borders on the heroic, and plays with intrigue much as John Fletcher did before him and as Restoration wits would do later on. How well he was known to playwrights and audiences after the Restoration, we shall presently see.

Of the nineteen or more plays usually included in the Beaumont and Fletcher canon in which Massinger had a hand (the number varies according to whether we follow Boyle, Fleay, Chelli, or Oliphant), I have taken no account, for they are included in the studies of Sprague and Wilson.[5] Nineteen plays by Massinger have survived, of which two, *Believe as You List* and *The Parliament of Love*, were in manuscript and probably not available during the years 1660-1700. A third, *The Old Law* (1656), written in collaboration with Middleton and Rowley, is never credited to Massinger in Restoration play lists (Chelli, p. 95, thinks he had no part in it). Eleven of the seventeen printed plays were adapted wholly or in part (*Bondman, City Madam, Guardian, Bashful Lover, New Way to Pay Old Debts, Renegado, Great Duke of Florence, Roman Actor, Very Woman, Virgin Martyr, Fatal Dowry*) before the death of Thomas Betterton, and several of the plays were acted in a form about which we have no specific record (*Bondman, Renegado, Roman Actor, New Way to Pay Old Debts, Virgin Martyr*). Almost as high a proportion of Massinger's plays was on the stage, then, as of Shakespeare's (twenty-nine out of thirty-seven) or of Beaumont and Fletcher's (thirty-nine out of fifty-three). Figures mean comparatively little, however, for we have only a fragmentary record of performances, and do not even know the names of all the plays that were revived.[6]

[5] Of the nineteen plays listed by Chelli (*Étude sur la Collaboration de Massinger avec Fletcher et son Groupe*, Paris, 1926, pp. 53-97) as the product of the collaboration of Massinger with Beaumont and Fletcher, twelve were revived between 1660 and 1720; see Wilson, pp. 135-143. If we include these plays with those in the strict Massinger canon, twenty-three out of thirty-six plays were revived in one from or another, an impressive total.

[6] John Downes' list of plays acted soon after the opening of the theaters ends

The restoration history of Philip Massinger's plays begins, as far as we know, with the organization of Rhodes's company at the Cockpit in Drury Lane about March, 1660. One of the first plays acted was Massinger's *Bondman*, in which Thomas Betterton won high applause as Pisander (*Roscius Anglicanus*, p. 18). The presumption is that *The Bondman* was performed a number of times during the summer and fall of 1660, but specific information is lacking.

The first dated performance was of another play and by a different company. *The Virgin Martyr* was acted on February 16, 1660/1, by the King's company at the Theatre in Vere Street. Pepys is our authority.

> I dined with my Lord and then to the Theatre, where I saw "The Virgin Martyr," a good but too sober a play for the company.

Some time during the year appeared Q 1661 of *The Virgin Martyr*, the only play by Massinger to be printed without alteration during the Restoration period.[7] No more unaltered plays were published until Dodsley brought out the eighth volume of *A Select Collection of Old Plays* in 1744.

Another performance of *The Virgin Martyr* seems to have been given on January 10, 1661/2, by the King's men. This is one of the performances for which Sir Henry Herbert tried to collect fees and for which Killigrew on June 4, 1662, promised to make payment.[8] The list includes a revival of *The Renegado* on June 6, 1662. No more is heard of *The Virgin Martyr* for another six years, except in the Browne MS, to which I shall refer presently; it may well have remained in repertory. Its influence, if any, would have been (1) in the direction of obscene comedy, because of the Hircius-Spungius scenes; (2) toward the development of scenic and operatic effects, because of the appearing and disappearing of Angelo and Harpax and of the spirits of Dorothea and others; and (3) in additional suggestions for the character of the Platonic heroine of the

with the significant phrase, "With divers others." *Roscius Anglicanus*, ed. Joseph Knight, London, 1886, pp. 17-9.

[7] Contrary to what seems to have been the usual practice, it was reprinted from a Commonwealth quarto, that of 1651, instead of from the last pre-Wars quarto, 1631, as will be shown by collation of the texts.

[8] J. Q. Adams, ed., *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert . . .*, New Haven, 1917, pp. 116-8.

heroic plays. Dorothea permits her lover to address her in only the chastest language.[9] And though for love of her he refuses to marry the daughter of the Roman emperor, and thus become heir to the throne, the former gives no evidence of affection for him, merely acquiescing before her martyrdom in his suggestion that when he has died of a broken heart his soul may wait on hers in Paradise.

Approximately a year after its first revival, *The Bondman* was still being acted.[10] Pepys's entry for March 1, 1660/1, is to the effect that he saw the play at the Whitefriars, where D'Avenant's company had been acting since its organization about November 5, 1660.[11] " An excellent play, and well done," he writes, " but above all that ever I saw, Betterton do the Bondman the best." This may mean that Pepys had seen *The Bondman* acted previously by Betterton here or at the Cockpit in Drury Lane, or that he had seen other actors give inferior performances, or merely that Betterton was better as Marullo than in any other of his rôles. In any event, Pepys idolized Betterton, and his interest in this play continued for seven years, when, after having seen it acted at least seven times, he read it again (November 2, 1666), " which the oftener I read the more I like."

The second dated performance, but certainly not the second seen by Pepys, was March 19, 1661. One week later, Pepys went again, this time with his wife. They sat in the pit at Salisbury Court and saw the play " done to admiration." He bought a copy of the play in Paul's Churchyard on May 25,[12] perhaps about the time that it was being revived by the Red Bull actors.

This group contained Charles Hart, Michael Mohun, John Lacy, Walter Clun, William Cartwright, and others, who had

[9] My attention was directed to this by Martin Krebs, who mentions it in *The Character and Origin of the English Heroic Play,* Master's essay, Johns Hopkins U. Library, unpub., 1930, p. 27.

[10] The stage history of Massinger's plays was worked out before the publication of Spencer's ed. of *The Bondman* and Kirk's ed. of *The City Madam.* I shall have occasion later to make two specific statements of indebtedness to them.

[11] J. L. Hotson, *The Commonwealth and Restoration Stage,* Cambridge, Mass., 1928, p. 239.

[12] Sprague, p. 17 n, records a performance on this date, by a misreading, probably, of this entry in the *Diary.*

acted before the Wars, and many of whom had fought for Charles I. They had begun acting at the Red Bull, but now were organized as the King's company under Thomas Killigrew at Gibbons's Tennis Court, after a stay at the Cockpit in Drury Lane and a short return to the Red Bull. Betterton's success in *The Bondman* may have inspired the revival by the other company. We learn of it from the list in Sir Henry Herbert's records referred to above. Discussion of the significance of the inclusion of *The Bondman* must be postponed until some consideration can be given to the date of the performance. The plays first mentioned in the list (*Argalus and Parthenia* and those preceding) have specific dates for their performance, and so do those that follow *The Dancing Master*. No such specific date is given for *The Bondman* or the six other plays grouped with it. Perhaps the play was acted in May, 1661, for the title appears opposite that month in Halliwell-Phillips's arrangement,[13] but it is possible that Mohun and the others who compiled the document may not have remembered the exact date but wished merely to indicate that the play had been presented by them.

The revival of a Jacobean play by two different companies raises the question of the rights of the various Restoration troupes in old plays. At least two other plays, *The Tamer Tamed* and *The Unfortunate Lovers*, were performed by two different companies (Sprague, p. 11), but this took place before the formal organization of the actors. In the case of *The Bondman*, there may have been a definite encroachment by one company on the other's rights. It has been argued that the old plays were divided between Killigrew and D'Avenant on the basis of possession of pre-Wars prompt books, but it seems to me extremely unlikely that the theatrical libraries of the pre-Wars companies could have been kept intact to descend to the Restoration companies.[14] We know, for instance, that manuscripts had to be collected from all sources for the publication

[13] In *A Collection of Ancient Documents Respecting the Office of Master of the Revels*, London, 1870, p. 34. Sprague, p. 16, and Adams, pp. 116-8, have slightly different arrangements of the titles and dates; a fourth is given by Edmond Malone, *Variorum Shakespeare*, 1821, 3. 272-6.

[14] H. Spencer, "The Restoration Play Lists," *RES* 1. 443-6; for the opposing view see A. Nicoll, "The Rights of Beeston and D'Avenant in Elizabethan Plays," *ibid.* 1. 84-91, and his rejoinder to Spencer, *ibid.* 1. 446.

of the Beaumont and Fletcher folio of 1647 (*The Wild Goose Chase* was not included because the MS became available too late). Many other dramatic manuscripts first reached the printer during the Commonwealth period, including those of Shirley's *Six New Plays* (1652-3), Massinger's *Three New Plays* (1655), and Brome's *Five New Plays* (1659). Furthermore, Andrew Pennycuicke, an actor at the old Cockpit, published not only *Sun's Darling* (1656), that had belonged to his own company, but also Massinger's *City Madam* (1658), from a prompt copy that had belonged to the rival Blackfriars actors.[15] If, as seems likely, the manuscripts were usually lost or destroyed by the printer after he finished with them, very few prompt copies could have survived in the possession of the actors, who would thus be forced to use pre-Wars quartos. It was to prevent unlimited competition in the use of these (and the surviving MS prompt books) that on December 12, 1660, D'Avenant was granted exclusive rights to certain plays and rights for a period of two months in certain others.[16] *The Bondman* is not named among the plays granted to D'Avenant, nor does it appear in the list of plays allotted to D'Avenant on August 20, 1668 (L. C. 5/139, p. 375; quoted by Nicoll, p. 315), or those confirmed to Killigrew about January 12, 1668/9 (L. C. 5/12, p. 212; see Nicoll, pp. 315-6). In view of the fact that seven of Massinger's plays (*Duke of Milan, Guardian, Bashful Lover, Emperour of the East, Fatal Dowry, Roman Actor,* and *Unnatural Combat*) are in Killigrew's list, it is surprising that no mention is made of plays as popular as *The Bondman* and *The Virgin Martyr*. Perhaps unnamed plays were regarded as common property.

In June, 1661, D'Avenant opened his new theater, the Opera, in Lincoln's Inn Fields with *The Siege of Rhodes,* and here on the fourth of November, 1661, Pepys saw *The Bondman* with his wife, but thought the acting inferior to that at Salisbury Court. On the twenty-fifth of the month he left a performance of *The Country Captain* at the Theatre to see the last act of *The Bondman* at the Opera.

[15] A. K. McIlwraith, "Pen-and-Ink Corrections in Books of the Seventeenth Century," *RES* 7. 204-7.

[16] L. C. 5/137, p. 343, quoted in part by Nicoll, pp. 314-5. References are to the first edition of Nicoll except where otherwise stated.

About this time Dr. Edward Browne saw three plays at "Salisbury or Dorset Court," two by Beaumont and Fletcher and the third, Massinger's *Bondman*.[17] The exact dates of the performances witnessed by Browne and the identity of the company acting at Dorset Court are more difficult to ascertain. Lawrence dates Browne's arrival in London late in 1662 and observes that Browne refers in one place to the "Kings playhouse in Convent Garden," which was not in use until May, 1663.[18] We may safely conclude that Browne saw *The Bondman* during the season 1662-3 (see also Sprague, pp. 21-4). Sprague believes it "likely that Betterton and his fellows, who had already put on all three pieces [referred to above], were the actors. If the performances in question took place in 1662-1663, they had probably quitted their resplendent 'Opera' temporarily—perhaps while it underwent repairs—to play at their former house, still standing at the time" (p. 23). Nicoll, on the other hand, assumes that at this time Jolly's men were acting at Salisbury Court; and if, as has been suggested, these

[17] I am indebted to Professor E. A. Strathmann of Pomona College for a transcript of the relevant portions of Browne's Memorandum Book, British Museum Sloane MS 1900. It is printed with certain differences in readings in W. W. Greg's article, "Theatrical Repertories of 1662," *Gentleman's Magazine* 301. 69-72.

[18] W. J. Lawrence, "A Forgotten Restoration Playhouse," *Eng. Stud.* 35. 279-89. The Browne MS is generally dated 1662 because of the date of the mileage table on folio 60a and because the record of plays seems to accord with the known facts of the years 1662-3. The *terminus a quem* is fixed by the fact that Browne departed from England in 1664. But there is no reason to suppose that Browne saw no plays in London until after he left Cambridge in 1662. In fact, Greg remarks of the entries that they were not all written at one time. One notation in the MS lends weight to the belief that Browne may have seen some of the plays before 1662 or early in that year. On folio 62b, opposite the entry for "Dr. Fostus" are words which Strathmann records as "K Licens: Players" (Hotson, p. 179 and note, agrees), but which Greg prints "Quens (?) Players." Now we have a record of the organization of a group of actors under that name in warrant L. C. 5/137, p. 333, dated December 17, 1661 (Nicoll, 2d ed., p. 274 and note), and references to a group, originally at the Red Bull, as "Queen's actors" in L. C. 5/137, p. 43, on February 5, 1661 (Nicoll thinks this is "probably 1661/2"), and again on December 29, 1663, in L. C. 5/138, p. 10. Another such reference occurs in L. C. 5/137, p. 173, on November 4, 1662, and still others come in 1665/6 and 1669 (see Nicoll, 2d ed., pp. 325-6). The earliest of these MSS includes Betterton with some of the Red Bull actors in a troupe to be known as "the Queenes Comoedians." Are we to suppose that Browne witnessed a performance by a "Royal Company" (the phrase is Nicoll's, p. 274, 2d ed.) at the Cockpit? If so, did the success of "*Fostus*" encourage a minor troupe to revive the play in the following spring at the Red Bull, where Pepys saw it on May 26, 1662, and found it "so wretchedly and poorly done, that we were sick of it"?

three plays were not the exclusive property of one of the major companies, he is probably correct. The performances must have taken place, then, before July 23, 1663, when Jolly's license of December 24, 1660, was revoked; probably they were given before January 27, 1662/3, the date of his license to act in the provinces (see Nicoll, pp. 276-7, 2d ed.).

In these formative months, we have found specific records of eight performances of *The Bondman* and evidence that there were others. It was presented by Rhodes's, D'Avenant's, and Killigrew's, and possibly by Jolly's men. So popular a play could hardly have failed to exert a strong influence on the taste of the audiences and on the writers of new plays. Possibly the pornographic scene (2.2) between the lascivious Corisca and her foolish step-son was deleted, but few changes would have been necessary in the character of Marullo, a perfectly chaste, perfectly self-controlled, almost Platonic lover.

We now turn again to the King's company. Their third known venture with a play of Massinger's was another performance of *The Virgin Martyr* on January 10, 1662. This is one of the performances for which Herbert tried to collect (see p. 282). The play was still in repertory in 1662/3, for Dr. Browne saw it at the "New Theatre in Lincoln's Inn fields." Opposite the name of the play Browne usually records the amount paid for admission; the tickets to *The Virgin Martyr* cost him nothing, perhaps because of the presence of "Mr. Wild," whose name appears on the line with the title.

In the same season, Browne saw a performance of *The Renegado* at Lincoln's Inn Fields, for which he paid 2s. 6d. The exact date is, of course, unknown, but it must have been earlier than May 6, 1663, when the King's men left this house. This calls to mind the fact that the King's men had acted the play on June 6, 1662 (see p. 282). As in the case of *The Virgin Martyr* above, the performance listed by Herbert may have been the one seen by Browne, but it may just as well have been another. Unlike *The Virgin Martyr* and *The Bondman*, which we have no reason for thinking were altered, *The Renegado* was probably changed for representation. MS Rawlinson Poet 20 in the British Museum is a version of *The Renegado* "written in a late seventeenth-century hand, and evidently made for a

revival of the play. . . . No cast is given and the manuscript bears no indication of having been used as a prompt copy." [19] After examining a photostat of the play, I agree that the MS is not a prompt copy.

The MS version changes the name of Vitelli's servant from Gazet to Iseppo, usually alters the spelling of Carazie to Corazie, and adds Muftie, Janizaries, and a Spye-Eunuch. The major changes are the excision of a bawdy scene (3. 4) ; the expansion of 2. 4, the courtship of Vitelli by Donusa; and the alteration of the concluding scene to make it more spectacular. For a colloquy between Asambeg and Mustapha and a messenger's account of the lovers' escape, the adapter substitutes an attack on the castle by Grimaldi and his sailors. Far from being anti-climactic, as in Massinger, the scene closes with stirring action. An important stylistic change is the breaking up of long declamatory speeches by the introduction in their midst of brief questions of fact that require explicit answers. The altered dialogue is much more like ordinary conversation. Minor changes are in the direction of (1) the modernization of manners and of diction, (2) the deletion or modification of obscene, indelicate, and low words and phrases, (3) the omission of Latin and other learned phrases, and (4) the avoidance of anything that might be regarded as irreverent (in 5. 3 the audience hears an account of the baptism of Donusa instead of seeing it on the stage).

About this time a fourth play by Massinger was revived. It has been customary to say that *A New Way to Pay Old Debts*, which held the stage in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries better than any non-Shakespearean play, was not revived until 1748.[20] We are indebted again to Edward Browne's MS for the

[19] The opinion of W. J. Lawrence, who first called attention to the MS, "The Renegado," *Times Literary Supplement*, Oct. 24, 1929.

[20] A. H. Cruickshank, ed., *A New Way to Pay Old Debts*, Oxford, 1926, p. x. Wilson, p. 126, lists a performance in 1708, but this seems to have been of *The Debauchee, or A New Way to Pay Old Debts* (see Genest 2. 405), the same play that Wilson lists in 1677 with the alternate title: *The Credulous Cuckold*. It is an adaptation of Brome's *Mad Couple Well Matched*, generally attributed to Mrs. Behn. See Langbaine's comment (sig. [A_3]) : "Crafty Book sellers, whose custom it is as frequently to vent old Plays with new Titles, as it has been the use of the Theatres to dupe the Town, by acting old Plays under new Names as if newly writ and never acted before; as, . . . The Debauchee, another [old Play] of Brome's." *Momus Triumphans* . . . , London, [1688].

record of the performance, which was at "the King's Armes, Norwich."[21] It was acted by Jolly's provincial company, presumably some time after he received his license on January 27, 1662/3, and before Browne left England in 1664. Nothing is known about the text of the play used for the performance.

Massinger's other realistic comedy, *The City Madam* 2.2, may have suggested to John Dryden a brief passage (3.1) in his *Wild Gallant*, produced at the Theatre Royal in February, 1662/3, but the resemblance is not great.[22]

In July of the following year (i.e., 1664), Pepys saw what must have been the first performance of *The Bondman* in that season. His entry for July 28 records that the actors "for want of practice . . . had many of them forgot their parts a little; but Betterton and my poor Ianthe outdo all the world. There is nothing more taking in the world with me than that play." This, as far as we know, is the last time Pepys saw the play. His delight in it continued, however, for he was reading it with increased enjoyment on November 2, 1666.

I find no further trace of revivals of Massinger's plays until 1668,[22a] when Killigrew offered *The Virgin Martyr* in what may well have been a revised form. In 1661 Pepys thought it "a good but too sober a play for the company." This time (February 27, 1667/8) he liked it better.

[21] B. M. Wagner, "George Jolly at Norwich," *RES* 6. 449-452.

[22] Suggested by Kathleen M. Lynch, "D'Urfe's L'Astrée and the 'Proviso' Scenes in Dryden's Comedy," *PQ* 4. 302-8; called to my attention by Mr. G. W. Knipp.

[22a] The anonymous author of "An Elegy Upon the Death of S[R]. William Davenant" must have been a lover of the old drama. He imagines the late poet laureate surrounded by the "Great Souls who once admired him here":

> First, *Johnson* doth demand a share in him,
> For both their Muses whip'd the Vice of time:
> Then *Shakespear* next a Brothers part doth claim,
> Because their quick Inventions were the same.
> *Beaumont* and *Fletcher* their Petitions joyn,
> This, for clear Style, that for his deep Design:
> *Tom Randolph* asks a Portion 'mongst the rest,
> Because they both were apt to break a Jest.
> *Shirley* and *Massinger* comes in for shares,
> For that his Language was refin'd as theirs. . . .

Reprinted from the original folio-broadside by G. Thorn-Drury in *A Little Ark* . . ., London: Dobell, 1921, pp. 35-7. D'Avenant died April 7, 1668, and this elegy was composed shortly thereafter. This is the only contemporary criticism I know that praises Massinger for his refinement of language.

The first time it hath been acted a great while: and it is mighty pleasant; not that the play is worth much, but it is finely acted by Becke Marshall.

Fortunately, for we have no text of this date, Pepys gives us several clues to the features of the performance.

But that which did please me beyond any thing in the whole world was the wind-musique when the angel comes down, which is so sweet that it ravished me, and indeed, in a word, did wrap up my soul so that it made me really sick, just as I have formerly been when in love with my wife; that neither then, nor all the evening going home, and at home, I was able to think of any thing, but remained all night transported, so as I could not believe that ever any musick hath that real command over the soul of a man as this did upon mee.

Small wonder that on March 2 he went to hear the music again, " which at this hearing the second time, do still commend me as nothing ever did, and the other musique is nothing to it." He did not attend the performance witnessed by King Charles on March 20.[23] Instead he spent the time practising the violin " in order to the inventing a better theory of musique than hath yet been abroad; and I think verily I shall do it."

Speculation about changes in the text is idle; doubtless they were much like those in *The Renegado*. The stage directions of the quartos of *The Virgin Martyr* offer abundant material for a manager in search of spectacular effects. At 4.3 Angelo enters " in the Angels habit "; in 5.1 he materializes—to the accompaniment of music—to Theophilus, Roman persecutor of the Christians, " with a basket filled with fruit and flowers " and after a few words vanishes. Later in the scene Harpax disappears beneath the stage and mocks Theophilus from first one trap door and then another, in imitation of the Ghost in *Hamlet*.[24] He re-enters " in a fearfull shape, fire flashing out of

[23] Warrant dated Aug. 29, 1668 (L.C. 5/139, p. 129), abstracted by Nicoll, pp. 304-5; also warrant (L. C. 5/12, p. 17). Nicoll notes that the second warrant gives the date as March 2 instead of March 20. Since Pepys makes no mention of the King's presence on March 2, the correct date for the warrant is probably March 20; but it is possible that the King attended two performances.

Nicoll records a performance on March 19 of which I have found no trace; see his note on p. 103, 2d ed.

[24] But see the discussion of this point in W. J. Lawrence's lecture, " 'Hamlet' as Shakespeare Staged It," delivered under the auspices of the Tudor and Stuart Club, as printed in *Johns Hopkins Alumni Magazine* 14. 451-68.

the studie." There are other such exits and entries. The one Pepys enjoyed so much is probably that in 5. 1. Angelo's other materialization from the spirit world (5. 2) is in the company of four others. The stage direction makes no mention of music or of descending figures. Perhaps such a heavenly host would have overtaxed the capacity of Killigrew's machinery.[25]

The question of the rights of the King's and the Duke's companies in the old plays seems to have been acute in 1668. Reference has already been made to two warrants (L. C. 5/139, p. 375, dated August 20, 1668; L. C. 5/12, p. 212, of date *c.* January 12, 1668/9) which confirmed twenty-three plays to D'Avenant and one hundred and eight to Killigrew. No Massinger titles appear in the first list, but in the second (Killigrew's) are *The Duke of Milan*, *The Unnatural Combat*, *The Bashful Lover*, *The Emperour of the East*, *The Fatal Dowry*, *The Roman Actor*, and "The Gardian." The temptation is to assert that all the plays mentioned in the two lists were revived on the Restoration stage. The ownership of the exclusive rights to an old play was not an academic question. And I am the more persuaded that every play named was actually revived, because such plays as *The Bondman* and *The Virgin Martyr*, known to have been acted by both companies, were excluded from the lists. In the case of the seven plays just named (perhaps this is true of other plays in the lists also), however, direct evidence is wanting. It is safe to say only that Killigrew had sufficient interest in these titles at this time (and, if the warrant be a re-issue of one originally granted in 1660, as some have supposed—see Wilson, p. 120—at that time too) to wish to reserve them to himself.

One of the plays in Killigrew's list requires special notice. Was "The Gardian" Massinger's play or Abraham Cowley's *Cutter of Coleman Street?* The method of grouping the titles suggests the former.[26] The plan of the list, to group the plays

[25] But see the stage directions for "several Spirits in horrid shapes flying down amongst the Sailers, then rising and crossing in the Air," and "a number of Aerial Spirits in the Air, Ariel flying from the Sun . . . ," quoted from the Shadwell version of *The Tempest* presented at Dorset Gardens, 1674, by Spencer, pp. 204-9.

[26] The first 14 plays are by Jonson; then follow 15 (or 16) plays by Beaumont and Fletcher, 3 by Shakespeare, 23 by Beaumont and Fletcher, 11 by Shakespeare, 1 by Cartwright (*The Royal Slave*, 1639, based in part on Massinger's *Bondman*, as pointed out by W. G. Rice, "Sources of William Cartwright's *The Royall Slave*,"

more or less by authors, is admittedly followed least toward the close, where "The Gardian" occurs between a play by Massinger and one by Suckling. I am inclined, nevertheless, to agree with Nethercott that the play allotted to Killigrew was Massinger's,[27] for the play called *Guardian* which was presented before royalty by the Duke's company at Lincoln's Inn Fields on August 9, 1668, and at Dorset Garden on November 17, 1672, and January 8, 1674/5,[28] was certainly Cowley's, despite the fact that when it was revived in 1661 in altered form the title used was *Cutter of Coleman Street*.[29] Why was the play acted under the title *Guardian* but printed as *Cutter*? Perhaps *Cutter* brought to mind memories of the early failure in 1661.[30] Inasmuch, then, as the Duke's company owned and acted Cowley's *Guardian* in 1668 and later, the play secured to the King's men must have been written by Massinger.

In the next play to be discussed, we meet the first printed adaptation of Massinger in the Restoration. *The Life of Mother Shipton. A New Comedy*, although "acted Nineteen dayes together with great Applause" (or so the title-page avers), was printed without date and with only the initials of the author, "T. T." Fortunately, T. T. wrote another play (printed in 1668) with signed dedication to one Mrs. Alice Barret. Langbaine first spotted the indebtedness to Massinger's *City Madam* and added that the plot was "from a Book so called in Prose, 4°" (*Momus Triumphans*, p. 25). In 1691 he expanded this account and commented on the use of only the author's initials.

MLN 45. 515-8), 7 by Shakespeare, 4 (or 5) by Shirley, 1 by Howard, 1 by Massinger, 1 that cannot be identified, 1 by Massinger, then "The Gardian," 1 by Suckling, 3 by Carlell, 1 by Massinger, 1 by Chapman, 1 by Suckling, 2 by the Duke of Newcastle, 1 by Massinger, 1 by Carlell, 1 by Suckling, 1 by Massinger, 1 by Barclay, an anonymous play, 2 by Middleton, 2 by Brome, 1 by Carlell, 1 by Massinger, 1 by Jonson and others, and finally 1 by Chapman.

[27] A. H. Nethercott, "Abraham Cowley as Dramatist," *RES* 4. 1-24.

[28] See warrants L. C. 5/139, p. 125, and L. C. 5/141, pp. 2, 216, excerpted by Nicoll, pp. 309-19.

[29] Pepys saw a performance on August 5, 1668, and was much disgusted to find it only *Cutter of Coleman Street* under a different name. A failure at its first revival after the Restoration, it was a distinct success in later years (see Cowley's preface to the 1663 edition and Downes, ed. Knight, p. 25).

[30] For another play that was revived under a new title but afterwards known by its first, see Nicoll, 2d ed., p. 379, where he discusses Boyle's *General*, which was known also as *Altamira*.

This Play has not the Author's Name to it, but the two first Letters: it may be he was asham'd to set his Name to other Mens Labours.[31]

He also gave Kirkman the credit for expanding T. T. into Thomas Thompson.[32] He made the mistake, however, of saying that the play was "acted Nine Days together" instead of nineteen, and there has been confusion about the matter ever since. Nineteen days was a long but not impossible run in those days. Biographical information about Thompson is entirely lacking. The British Museum has a poem of his, *Midsummer-Morn; or, The Livery Man's Complaint* (1682), and he wrote the other play referred to above, *The English Rogue* (1668). It is entirely probable that there was some connection between Thompson and Richard Head, who wrote the first part of *The English Rogue* (1665) in association with Francis Kirkman and a pamphlet, *The Life and Death of Mother Shipton* (1677). In addition to the similarities of titles, there is identity of subject matter, not in the two *English Rogues*, but in the two accounts of Mother Shipton. The earliest account of Shipton in the British Museum Catalogue is dated 1641. Others with varying titles appeared in 1642, 1643, 1648, 1662, 1663, 1677, 1684, 1685, 1687, 1697, 1740, 1775, 1797, 1810, 1811, 1815, 1825, 1870, 1871, 1873, and 1882. The early pamphlets contain the jingling prophecies attributed to Mother Shipton, but the first I have seen that has narrative resembling the play is that of 1687, written by Head, which as we have seen was published also in 1677.[33] If it were not for the date of the earliest known quarto (1677), I should say without hesitation that the pamphlet was Thompson's source. But we know from Kirkman's list that the play was in existence at least by 1671. The parallels are obvious and are of such a nature that Head

[31] *An Account of the English Dramatick Poets . . .*, Oxford, 1691, pp. 503-4.

[32] Francis Kirkman, "An Exact Catalogue of all English Stage-Plays printed, till this present Year 1671," added to *Nicomede* by John Dancer, 1671.

[33] *The Life and Death of Mother Shipton. Being not only a true Account of her strange Birth; the most important Passages of her Life; but also all her Prophesies, now newly Collected . . . until this present Year 1667 . . .*, London, . . . W. Harris . . ., 1687. Reprinted by Edwin Pearson, Westminster, 1871. The prefatory remarks are signed by Head, who says he secured the MS from a family which may have come into possession of it at the destruction of the monasteries in the time of Henry VIII. Pearson suggests in his Critical Preface that William Lilly (1602-1681) was the original of "Mother Shipton."

could not easily have borrowed from Thompson. For example, in the prose narrative, the first part of a double charm which Mother Shipton repeats at the instance of the devil is as follows: "*Raziel* ellimihammirammish*ziragia Psonthonphanchia* Raphaelelhaverunatapinotambecazmitzphecat jarid cuman hapheah Gabriel Heydon turris dungeonis philonomostarkes sophecord hankim." Such stuff is not easy to memorize; in the play Thompson uses only the italicized portions, giving them thus: "Raziel, Ziragia, Phonthonfancia." It may be that Head's narrative was written much earlier than 1677, the date of the earliest known quarto. In fact, this seems probable, for the account closes with the great fire of 1666, and the title-page states that the prophecies are collected "until this present year 1667." In the *Stationers' Register*, furthermore, there is an entry to Mrs. Ann Maxwell, dated August 30, 1667: "The life and death of Mother Shipton, or true Relacon of what she did and spakt."[34] If this was an earlier edition of Head's narrative, Thompson may well have used it.[35]

[34] It is worth noting that Mrs. Ann Maxwell was the widow of David Maxwell, who died about 1665. David Maxwell published *Mercurius Publicus* until the time of his death, when Peter Lilliecrap took it up, Peter Lilliecrap the printer of Thompson's *Mother Shipton*. See H. R. Plomer, *A Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers . . . from 1641 to 1667*, London, 1907.

[35] Another possibility presents itself, but it is merest conjecture, and it is apparently negatived at the outset by the existence of Thompson's poem, *Midsummer-Morn*, referred to above. Head returned to London from Ireland in 1663 and printed his play, *Hic et Ubique*. Other works appeared rapidly until 1666 or 1667. There is a gap in his publications until 1672. After that Head continued prolific. Throughout this whole period, according to the *DNB*., Head was in straightened circumstances and made a living doing hack work. Now "T. T.'s" plays were printed in 1668 and, as we shall see, between that date and 1671. This is the interval during which Head published nothing under his own name. Did Head write the "T. T." plays, borrowing the title of one from his own *English Rogue*, and basing the other on his *Life of Mother Shipton*?

There is another possible point of contact between *Mother Shipton* and Head: in the play there is a group of beggars, who praise their calling as enthusiastically as those in Brome's *Jovial Crew*; Head wrote a *Canting Dictionary* in 1673.

Why should Head have wished to conceal his identity? Perhaps for the same reason that he refused to continue *The English Rogue* with Kirkman, because people insisted that all the scandalous and criminal episodes were autobiographical. In the prefatory note to his *Life of Mother Shipton*, Head was careful to point out that he was acting merely as the editor of an old MS. His reputation was such that he could ill afford to be suspected of any connection with witchcraft.

Why the initials "T. T."? They were very popular with anonymous writers of the time. A great many pamphlets signed "T. T." have survived, the best known of which is, I suppose, *Quaker's Quibbles*, 1675.

The date of *Mother Shipton* has been variously given as "[1660?]" by Nicoll (p. 375); "about 1668" (Halliwell-Phillips's *Dictionary of Old English Plays*, p. 175); and 1671 (Baker's *Companion to the Play-house*, 1764, vol. 1, sig. [Gg_5^v]; vol. 2, sig. [O_6^v]; *Playhouse Pocket-Companion*, 1779, p. 114). The later limit is 1671, the date of Kirkman's list. The history of Thomas Passinger, the bookseller who handled the play, helps fix the earlier limit of publication. He succeeded to his master's business in 1664 (Plomer, p. 145). The interval of 1664 to 1671 is narrowed by three years if Head's narrative *Life of Mother Shipton* was actually printed in 1667; it is narrowed still further by the Prologue to Thompson's other play, printed in 1668. These are the significant lines:

> Ye'r welcome to the labour of a Muse;
> Who do's implore (and 'tis your pitty worth
> Your helping hands to bring her firstling forth,
> And let me tell ye, 'tis most necessary
> Since 'tis her first you act more kind and wary.[36]

If the Prologue may be relied on, Thompson wrote *Mother Shipton* after *The English Rogue*. And if the plays were printed in the order in which they were written, *Mother Shipton* can be dated with some certainty as having been printed between 1668 and 1671. Since plays were usually printed soon after their appearance on the stage, *Mother Shipton* was probably written in these same years.[37]

This conjecture has its origin in the fact that we know nothing about the Thomas Thompson named by Kirkman in his list dated 1671. There are records of men of this name, however; see the following: (1) a London bookseller (?), who received his freedom July 6, 1635, and whose name appears in the imprint of several pamphlets dated 1642; (2) a gentleman, widower, of Isle of Ely, who married Katherine Burroughs of St. Margaret, Westminster, widow, in London on April 8, 1661; (3) a gentleman, bachelor, of Canterbury, who married Mrs. Phoebe Hammond of Canterbury at St. Bride, London, on June 29, 1663; (4) a clerk, rector of Skegnes, co. Linc., who on October 29, 1672, married Mary Parish of Fishtoft, Lincolnshire. The first is named in Plomer's *Dictionary of Booksellers and Printers*; the others, in Joseph Foster's *London Marriage Licenses, 1521-1869*, London, 1887.

[36] For an accurate transcript of this prologue, I am indebted to Mr. C. K. Edmonds of the Henry E. Huntington Library, the quarto I have consulted in the Library of Congress being imperfect.

[37] If this dating is correct, the play cannot be identified with *Mother Rumming*, as suggested by W. W. Greg (*A List of Masques, Pageants, &c., . . .* London, 1902, Appendix II, p. xc). Nothing more is known of *Mother Rumming* than that the title appears in Archer's list printed at the end of Massinger's *Old Law* (1656).

The quarto of *Mother Shipton* is badly printed. Turned letters and misspelled words are frequent. Punctuation is scanty in some places but excellent in others. Whoever prepared the manuscript for printing was careful to indicate act and scene divisions (except at 5.6) and to insert brief stage directions.[38] But blank verse is always printed as prose. Only the songs and the couplets are printed in verse form. The quarto may have been printed from a reported version, for the scenes are very short—many are only one page in length, and not more than three or four exceed two pages—and a number of scenes open with a soliloquy which is intended to introduce some character and narrate what has happened since he last appeared.

The Life of Mother Shipton has two plots, one involving Mother Shipton and Radamon and derived from the accounts of the life of the witch, and another, a complicated intrigue based chiefly on Middleton's *Chaste Maid in Cheapside*. The scenes which owe most to Massinger's *City Madam* are *Mother Shipton* 1.5 and 5.5, but Thompson took other hints. The characters in the two plots are never brought together; they are connected by a third group which comes into contact with each of the other groups just once. The characters are carefully balanced, with five couples: the Whorehounds, the Shiftwells, Maria and Moneylack, Shipton and Radamon, Pluto and Proserpina. In addition, Hairbrain, Swagger, and the Captain pair off with Priscilla and the two whores. At the end of the play, all the characters in the intrigue plot are connections by blood or marriage. The dialogue is very poor except for the passages taken over from Massinger and Middleton. And only in the borrowed scenes is there much action on the stage. The method of the plagiarist was to find suitable passages in one of his sources and to rearrange them with the minimum of verbal changes. The play's success must have resulted from the outspokenness of the men and women in the intrigue plot and from

[38] A stage direction on page 49 seems to imply that a Restoration stage might sometimes have a partition like the inside wall of a house to produce the effect of two adjoining rooms: "The Scene a Tavern. Sir *Oliver. Shiftwel, Moneylack David* and a *Scrivener, Shiftwells* wife *Maria* and Sir *Olivers* wife apart as in another room." But perhaps the two groups stayed at opposite ends of the stage and left the audience to imagine a partitioning wall between them.

the spectacular effects made possible by the introduction of witches, devils, beggars, and an angel.

A brief notice of *The Virgin Martyr* in 1672 indicates its continued popularity. Softhead in Lacy's *Dumb Lady* exclaims (1. 2) : " You lie! and for the honour of squirehood I'll die a virgin martyr." [39] The reference may be to the revival of *The Virgin Martyr* in 1668, for Lacy's play was first acted at the Theatre Royal in 1669.

During the next few years there are no records of revivals of Massinger's plays. In 1677-8, however, Shadwell's *True Widow* (Dorset Garden, *c.* March) appeared with a scene built around an incident borrowed from *A New Way to Pay Old Debts* 5. 1. Lady Cheatly abuses and defrauds her creditors by means of disappearing ink and wax, as Marrall deludes Sir Giles Overreach.[40] About two years later, Lee's *Theodosius, or, The Force of Love* (*c.* September, 1680) was brought out at the same theater. Baker seems to have been the first to comment on the fact that the play deals with the same central characters as Massinger's *Emperour of the East* and to suggest that Lee may have

> borrowed some Hints from this Play; particularly that of *Theodosius's* Negligence as to public Affairs extending to such a Length, as the giving his Sister *Pulcheria* an absolute Power even over the Life of his beloved *Athenais*, by means of a Blank signed and delivered to her.[41]

The chief characters are indeed the same, but they are conceived in an entirely different spirit. Lee based his play on a translation (1666) of La Calprenède's *Pharamond*, as Langbaine (*Dramatick Poets*, p. 327) pointed out in detail; he took (*Theodosius* 4. 1) from Massinger (*Emperour of the East* 3. 2, 4) only the incident noted by Baker.

The plundering of Massinger began in earnest in 1680 with *The Guardian* as the chief victim. As in so many other cases, Langbaine was the first to record the plagiarism in *Love Lost in the Dark*; *or, The Drunken Couple. Acted at New-Market.*

[39] Genest 1. 97; J. Maidment and W. H. Logan, ed., *The Dramatic Works of John Lacy, Comedian . . .* , Edinburgh, 1875, p. [3].

[40] Called to my attention by Mr. W. B. Terwilliger, this indebtedness was first noted by Saintsbury, Mermaid ed. of Shadwell, p. 121.

[41] *Companion to the Play-House*, vol. 2, sig. G_2.

(*Momus Triumphans*, p. 31 n; *Dramatik Poets*, p. 542. He did not particularize because he did not have the play at hand.) Genest (10. 146) classified *Love Lost in the Dark* as "unacted," and explained that "nearly the whole of this F[arce] is stolen from Massinger—the bulk of it is from the Guardian—some parts of it are from a Very Woman, and the Bashful Lover." Cruikshank noted the fact that one character, Calandrino, derives his name from *The Great Duke of Florence*.[42] *Love Lost in the Dark* was printed in 1680 with two other farces, *The Merry Milkmaid of Islington*; *or, The Rambling Gallants Defeated* and *The Politick Whore*: *or, The Conceited Cuckold*, under the general title, *The Muse of Newmarket*. The three were entered separately to James Vade in the *Term Catalogue* (1. 440) at Easter, 1681; so the printing must have been done about the turn of the year (January to March), 1680/1, and the plays were probably written and acted not long before, possibly at the time of the races in the previous fall, when we know that Pepys attended on Charles II at Newmarket (*Diary*, ed. Wheatley, vol. 1, p. xxxv). The identity of the first adapter of *The Guardian* is unknown, and we know no more about the company that acted the play. Since, as we have seen, *The Guardian* was probably awarded to Killigrew in 1668/9, some member of his company may have hashed up the adaptation. The droll is so wretchedly put together that I think it was intended for use by the minor actors or some provincial company. And from the fact that the few "original" portions are given to Calandrino and Moggulla, the low comedians, and that these insertions are almost unprintable gags, I believe the actors playing these two parts may well have prepared the adaptation.[43]

[42] A. H. Cruickshank, *Philip Massinger*, Oxford, 1920, pp. 24-5.

[43] It is possible that the three farces are from the pen of one adapter. If so, he was probably not a Londoner and possibly not an actor. The Prologue to *The Merry Milkmaid* pleads with the audience:

> For once be courteous to a Country Muse
> Vntaught, such Tricks the Wits of London use;
> And in short time, he may find out the way
> To write fine Poppet Plays as well as they.

The Epilogue to this farce suggests that the three adaptations were acted as one evening's entertainment, comparing the pleasure of three short plays to that of one long one.

What the adapter (or adapters) did was to take a copy of *Three New Playes* (1655), which contains *The Guardian*, *The Bashful Lover*, and *A Very Woman*, and from these patch up a play. He did not take the trouble even to arrange as verse the passages lifted bodily from the originals. The droll was hastily prepared, or else the manuscript supplied the printer was very inferior, for mistakes abound. The play is straight farce, free from classical allusions, descriptive and moralizing passages, and romantic characters and incidents. Every effort is made towards simplicity and directness, and all the emphasis is on intrigue and obscenity.

Two years later Mrs. Aphra Behn tried her hand at adapting *The Guardian*. " 'Tis true indeed," writes Langbaine (*Momus Triumphans*, sig. [a_3]),

> what is borrow'd from Shakspeare or Fletcher, is usually own'd by our Poets, because every one would be able to convict them of Theft, should they endeavour to conceal it. But in what has been stolen from Authors not so generally known, as Murston [*sic*], Middleton, Massenger, &c. we find our Poets playing the parts of Bathyllus to Virgil, and robbing them of that Fame, which is . . . justly their due.

Langbaine describes the indebtedness in detail (*Momus Triumphans*, p. 2, and again in *Dramatick Poets*, pp. 17-9); Baker adds to the account the statement that " Mrs. Behn has also introduced into this Play a great Part of the Inner Temple Masque, by Middleton " (*Companion to the Play-House*, vol. 2, sig. [D_5^v]). As Summers points out in his edition of Mrs.

That the farces were acted by a provincial company is strongly suggested by some lines from the Prologue to *Love Lost in the Dark*:

> Our Habits and our Acting such appears,
> Like weather-beaten weary Travellers:
> Who have endur'd more then may here be told,
> From Eastern blasts and sharper Northern cold.
> Which keeps our sadded Hearts in deep suspence,
> Wanting a place to fix our Residence.
> Yet if these Radiant Beauties will but please
> To smile on our Endeavours, 'twill much ease
> Our cares, abate our Feares: well knowing then,
> Their Influence creates Favours in those Men:
> Whom noble Bounty and Compassion may,
> Transform our sable Night to chearful Day.
> So by your Goodness with your mercy mixt,
> We wandring Planets may in time be fixt.

Behn's *Works* (2. 198), " this charge is absolutely unfounded." Chelli has suggested, only to deny it, a possible indebtedness to *A New Way to Pay Old Debts* (p. 258 n). He must have in mind the relationship of uncle to nephew which is found in each play, but this is much more satisfactorily traced to Middleton's *Mad World, my Masters*, the other play which Mrs. Behn draws on in writing *The City Heiress*.

One of the most amusing political plays of the Restoration is *The City Heiress*; *or, Sir Timothy Treaty-all*. It opened at Dorset Garden on May 15, 1682,[44] with a brilliant cast, but its run was short, possibly because of the political satire. It was, however, revived in 1707 (Genest, 2. 374) and adapted by Charles Johnson in 1715; this adaptation was altered in turn by later playwrights. Mrs. Behn took from Massinger and Middleton whatever would complicate her intrigue plot and add sprightliness to her lines. She added enough, however, to integrate the material and make a sparkling though very naughty play. The difference between pre-Wars and Restoration comedy may be easily indicated by reference to the changes Mrs. Behn has made in her characters and incidents. Her Sir Anthony is Massinger's Durazzo without his sturdiness; Wilding, who is both Adorio and Follywit, is wilder, more eloquent, more fascinating than either. He agrees to marriage at the end of Act 5, not in the middle of Act 2, as Adorio does. Equally significant is the fact that Mrs. Behn gives him success with his whore, an assignation with his mistress, success in the theft of his uncle's papers, and, finally, the hand of the beautiful heiress who eloped with him. To the uncle is given the cast-off whore. Not so in Middleton. There the uncle retains most of his property, and the young libertine is gulled into marrying his uncle's cast-off mistress. Notice, too, that Massinger depicts the abandoned passion of an elderly matron in such a manner that we are thoroughly disgusted with her. Middleton depicts a scene of seduction, but makes his lovers repent and reform. The pre-Wars plays may in their characters and situations have been quite as immoral as *The City Heiress*, but Mrs. Behn's attitude and treatment are different. She stimulates the senses

[44] Summers gives this date in his ed. of *Roscius Anglicanus*, p. 227. See also p. 226.

in a way that would have shocked the moralist in Massinger and the realist in Middleton.

After the union of the King's and Duke's companies in 1682, a play in the possession of the former became available for Betterton's use. Davies is the authority for the statement that Betterton acted the rôle of Paris in *The Roman Actor*. *The Bondman*, he says, " was the only Play of Massinger revived after the Restoration; till Mr. Betterton took a fancy to the Part of Paris, in the *Roman Actor*." [45] The revival may have occurred about this time, 1682, or as late as 1692, when Genest (3. 82) lists a performance, apparently quoting indirectly from a play bill. If the play was indeed a favorite with Betterton, the version which was printed in 1722 may owe something to him.

At the death of John Lacy (September 17, 1681), a play was found which derives in part from *The City Madam* and perhaps *A New Way to Pay Old Debts*. This is *Sir Hercules Buffoon*; *or, The Poetical Squire*, which was first acted at Dorset Garden in 1684, three years after Lacy's death. The initial situation of the serious plot is probably suggested by *The City Madam*. Sir Marmaduke Seldin is just as thorough-going a scoundrel as Luke Frugal and almost as much of a hypocrite. His plan is to ship his wards out of the country, not to America to be victims of savages, but to the north of Norway, where they are to be devoured by bears (perhaps suggested by *The Winter's Tale*). The heiresses are saved by a sentimental turn of the plot. At the end of the play (5. 2), Lord Arminger attempts to convert Sir Marmaduke with a device used in *The City Madam* 5. 2. At this point, Lacy turns from *The City Madam* to *A New Way*, makes Seldin rave at his daughters as Overreach does at Margaret, and sends him to a madman's death, like Overreach's.[46]

[45] Note signed " D." in *Roscius Anglicanus*, ed. Waldron, London, 1789, p. 26.

[46] Mariana's reasons for renouncing her suitor, Lord Armiger, are of unusual interest.

> You made love to an impostor, a false woman; and now you know the cheat, are you so weak to think your honour is engaged to make that courtship good to that impostor? . . . My Lord, this heart and every drop of blood within it has more love for you than Dido quitted life for; yet all this can I conquer to be just, therefore must not in point of honour marry.

These are sentiments that about the turn of the century will be found in senti-

There is no reason for thinking that Dryden was at all influenced by Massinger's *Believe as You List* (then still in MS form only) in writing *Don Sebastian*. The only similarity is that Massinger's play in its original form and Dryden's play deal with the same historical character.

The last major plagiarism to be treated in this paper is that of Edward Ravenscroft, who in his *Canterbury Guests*; *or, A Bargain Broken*, took material from *A New Way*. This play, which appeared first at Drury Lane in 1697, is not an adaptation of *A New Way*, but rather an alteration of Ravenscroft's own *Careless Lovers* (Dorset Garden, March, 1672/3), with additions from his *King Edgar and Alfreda* (Drury Lane, about December, 1677), Molière's *Monsieur de Pourceaugnac*, and *A New Way to Pay Old Debts*. The first performance, according to Nicoll (p. 370) was about September, 1694. Genest (2. 57-8), in his discussion of Ravenscroft's plagiarism, suggests that the play may have been acted in May of that year because the contract between Buffler and Furr in 3. 4 is dated the third of May.

Ravenscroft uses farcical elements from all of his sources and adds enough horseplay to make a fair theatrical success. Usually he expands what he borrows, rarely copying a line or two without some verbal changes. A desire to avoid the rhythm of blank verse would account for this in the use of Massingerian material. Ravenscroft has no desire to improve on his sources and certainly no idea of purifying them. What he wants is a swiftly moving farce with plenty of sure-fire hits, and he comes near writing one. But the play met with little favor and does not seem to have been revived.

There is some reason for thinking that Ravenscroft made the acquaintance of a number of Massinger's plays long before 1694. Durzo, for instance, comes to *The Canterbury Guests* from *King Edgar and Alfreda*, but the name sounds like Durazzo in Massinger's *Guardian*; it is sufficiently out of the ordinary to require some explanation. The name Lovell is found frequently in literature of this period, and it is probably

mental comedy. They are noteworthy here because Lacy had no high moral purpose; he designed only to cater to his public. And we may be reasonably sure that he worked into his plays only the elements that he knew from observation would please. 1681 is an early date for a sentimental heroine like Mariana.

only coincidence that Lord Lovel is one of the characters in *A New Way* and that Mr. Lovell is in *The Careless Lovers*. Again, Muchworth, the old Alderman of the latter play, has a common enough name, and it is not necessary to believe that it was suggested by the name Alworth in *A New Way*. Finally, the portion of *The Careless Lovers* (Act 4) which confronts Lord DeBoastado with Mrs. Breedwel and Mrs. Clappam, while undoubtedly based on Molière's *Pourceaugnac* (2. 9, 10), may well owe something to Massinger's *Unnatural Combat* 4. 2. In this scene, a bawd and two wenches with two children set upon Belgardo and charge that he is the father of the children. Each of these points of resemblance is in itself trivial; taken together, they may have some cumulative value.

In *The Canterbury Guests*, Ravenscroft borrows from *A New Way* Justice Greedy, a suggestion of the Innkeepers, Jack Sawce (called Order by Massinger's), and Dash, who is given the comic lines of Massinger's Marrall, as well as scenes in which these characters appear. The play derives its alternate title from a speech of Sir Giles Overreach (*A New Way* 3. 2. 217-8, ed. Cruickshank):

Mum, villaine, vanish: shall we breake a bargaine almost made up.

The play is in prose, except for couplets at the end of 1. 8, 3. 5, 5. 6, 8, and in the middle of 4. 9. The French practice of beginning a scene with the entrance of each new character is followed in this play but not in *The Careless Lovers* or *King Edgar and Alfreda*.

One of the most amusing incidents in this play, and also in *The Careless Lovers*, is the " proviso " scene in which Careless and Hillaria agree to wed. The possible origin of such scenes has been traced by Miss Lynch through Dryden to D'Urfe and in another branch ultimately to Massinger's *City Madam* 2. 2.[47] There can be little doubt that Ravenscroft borrowed from Dryden's *Wild Gallant* 3. 1 in writing *The Careless Lovers* and retained the scene in *The Canterbury Guests*.

Three more plays before 1700 must be referred to. The first of these, Thomas Dilke's *City Lady* (Lincoln's Inn Fields, *c.* January, 1696/7), does not resemble Massinger's *City Madam* in diction or plot, but has enough similarities in characters to

[47] " Durfe's L'Astrée and the ' Proviso ' Scenes in Dryden's Comedy," *PQ* 4. 302-8.

convince Kirk that Dilke must have had Massinger's play in mind.[48] The second, the anonymous *Timoleon*; *or, The Revolution* (quarto 1697), has the same source as Massinger's *Bondman*, and seems to Spencer to have been slightly influenced by the older play.[49] The last play of all to be mentioned is Congreve's *Way of the World* (Lincoln's Inn Fields, March, 1699-1700). This famous play contains a proviso scene which may be traceable to Massinger's *City Madam* 2.2. There are even verbal similarities in several lines. Did Congreve merely follow in the tradition of Ravenscroft and Dryden, or did he remember the old play?

The period, 1660-1700, ends just before Rowe's famous *Fair Penitent* (1703; based on Massinger and Field's *Fatal Dowry*); not many years later Benjamin Griffin produced and published an adaptation of *The Virgin Martyr* under the title, *Injured Virtue*: *or, The Virgin Martyr* (1715); four years after this appeared an anonymous adaptation of *The Bondman* (1719), and three years later an anonymous version of *The Roman Actor* (1722). Throughout the whole Restoration period and well into the next century, then, Massinger's plays were read and acted. Less frequently performed and adapted than those of Shakespeare and of Beaumont and Fletcher, his plays must nevertheless have exerted a very considerable influence on playwrights and audiences.

The Johns Hopkins University

[48] R. Kirk, ed. *The City Madam*, Princeton, 1934, pp. 40-1.

[49] B. T. Spencer, ed., *The Bondman*, Princeton, 1932, pp. 258-9. Nicoll, 2d ed., p. 351, notes that the play was probably unacted and that the Bodleian copy is attributed in a MS note to Southby.

VITA

James G. McManaway was born August 24, 1899, in Fayette, Missouri. He received his early education in the public school of Waynesville, North Carolina, and in the high school of Charlottesville, Virginia, from which he graduated in 1916. He was then a student at the University of Virginia, graduating with the B. A. degree in 1919 and the M. A. degree in 1920. He was a member of the faculty of Virginia (Junior) College for Women at Roanoke, Virginia, from 1923 to 1927 and associate professor of English at Mississippi A. and M. College in 1927-28, resigning this post to take up graduate study at the Johns Hopkins University. He held a special appointment for five summers in the Division of Maps and Charts of the Library of Congress. During his years of residence as a graduate student he gave courses in English in the Johns Hopkins Summer School, the College for Teachers, and the College of Arts and Sciences and served as secretary of the graduate department of English. The degree of Doctor of Philosophy was granted in June, 1931. At present he is chiefly engaged in work on the Variorum Spenser, with the rank of Associate in English.